



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The 'Annals of Murād II'

Author(s): V. L. Ménage

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (1976), pp. 570-584

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/614715>

Accessed: 18/10/2008 07:36

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



School of Oriental and African Studies and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE 'ANNALS OF MURĀD II'

By V. L. MÉNAGE

It is now some years since Professor Halil İnalçık expressed the hope¹ that a 'systematic investigation in the library collections of Turkey' might bring to light, in their original independent form, the fifteenth-century Ottoman 'calendars' (*takvīm*) or 'chronological lists' whose existence is to be postulated from the analysis of the style and content of the chronicle-texts² into which they have evidently been incorporated.³ The subject of these lists was then much in my mind, so that while I was in Turkey in 1958-9 I was on the look-out for such a text. My search, if not 'systematic', was fairly thorough; all the same, it was fruitless: I came upon several late examples, to indicate that the chronological list remained a favourite form of compilation beyond the fifteenth century, but no early self-contained text, relating the events of two or three decades, of the type whose existence the chronicles indicated. The kindness of a colleague, however, has now led me in London to what I believe to be the copy of such a text.

Mr. Simon Digby recently showed me an Ottoman manuscript which he acquired after the Phillipps sale of 25 November 1968.⁴ The principal work in it (fols. 1v-121r), written in a very clear *naskh* (? sixteenth century), fully vocalized, is an anonymous Ottoman chronicle relating the history of the dynasty from its legendary beginnings down to Bāyezīd II's Moldavian campaign (misdated 886, for 889/1484).⁵ Inserted in it (fols. 75r-95r) is the

¹ In a paper entitled 'The rise of Ottoman historiography' presented to a conference held at the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1958 and thereafter printed in B. Lewis and P. M. Holt (ed.), *Historians of the Middle East*, London, 1962, at p. 159.

² Namely, the 'Anonymous Chronicles' edited by F. Giese (*Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken*, I, Breslau, 1922, and II (translation) in *Abh. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XVII, 1, 1925, 1-170) and the chronicle of Uruc (Oruç) b. 'Adil (ed. F. Babinger from the MSS of Oxford and Cambridge, Hanover, 1925; another MS at Manisa, two more at Paris), whom Dr. Beldiceanu-Steinherr has now proved to have been living in Edirne in the middle years of the reign of Bāyezīd II (*BSOAS*, XXXIII, 2, 1970, 359-63).

³ See, e.g., Lewis and Holt (ed.), *Historians of the Middle East*, 157-9 (İnalçık) and 170-2 (Ménage). The lists incorporated into these chronicles are similar in style but quite different in content from the 'royal' lists, compiled in the Palace, which have survived in independent form (for them, see V. L. Ménage, *Neshri's history of the Ottomans*, London, 1964, 15).

⁴ It was Lot 237 in Sotheby's sale-catalogue of that date (*Bibliotheca Phillipica, New Series: medieval manuscripts*, pt. IV), having been MS 871 in the collection of the eccentric bibliophile Sir Thomas Phillipps (1792-1872). It had earlier been in the possession of Auguste Chardin, being Lot 2628 in the Chardin sale of 9 February 1824 in Paris. It now bears the number 160 in Mr. Digby's private collection. I am most grateful to the present owner for allowing me to describe the contents and to publish a section of the text.

⁵ The text begins, after the *besmele*, etc.: *Ammā ba'd: bu risālenün fāliblerine ve nāzırlarına i'lām olınan budur-ki bir cemā'at ihvān-i şādık ve hullān-i yārān-i muvāfık bu az'aflı 'l-'ibād-i biçāreye ikdām gösterüb eyidiler: Her fuşahā ve bulağādan işbu 'ālem-i fānide def'-i melāl ve kafl'-i sü'āl için bir yādīgār komışlardır; eyle olsa . . . and ends: . . . dönüb girü İstanbula geldi. Va'llāhu a'lem. Rāvī eydür: ol zamānda tāriḥ seksen altıındaydı. Bundan soñra Sultān Bāyezīd Hān Edrenede bir 'ālī 'imāret ve bir medrese ve bir tımārḥāne ve bir ḥammām ve bir köprü yaptırdı*

'Legendary history of Constantinople'. There is a colophon: the copyist, Maḥmūd b. 'Abdullāh, completed his work 'at noon on a Saturday in Cumādā I' (no year), in a certain 'village' which I cannot identify.⁶ A European hand has added 'dans la petite tartarie'. On the flyleaf the same hand⁷ has written 'Histoire de la famille Othomane'; beneath this appears, in an earlier hand, 'Taouarikh al Othman. Historia gentis Othomannicae ab ipso Othomanno ad annum Hegirae 855. Turcicè'.

This main work is an abridged, popularized, and much mutilated text of 'Āşıkpaşazāde, and is therefore similar in character (though not in textual detail) to the Paris MS Ancien fonds 118.⁸ It lacks 'Āşıkpaşazāde's autobiographical references, his verses, and his characteristic chapter-headings; but that it derives from 'Āpz. (and is not a putative source of his) is evident from its presenting material in the order which 'Āpz. may be presumed to have imposed on his sources.⁹ The abridgement is very drastic, particularly towards the end. Nevertheless the text is padded out with conventional, indeed incantatory, descriptions of battles,¹⁰ and the redactor has also added a few details not found in 'Āpz.: the story that Bāyezid I killed himself with poison concealed in a ring,¹¹ and a further echo of the popular conviction that Murād II's son 'Alā'eddīn did not die a natural death.¹²

Clear and careful as the hand of this work is, and in spite of its lavish vocalization, it offers a very poor text; and the same, regrettably, is true for

[ve] mūsāfir ve ğurebā ve fuḳarā ve talebe rāḥat olmağışūn. Va'llāhu a'lem. There is an interesting bibliographical peculiarity at fol. 1r. This page is filled with text, in the same hand as the rest of the MS, but this text is not (as Sotheby's cataloguer believed) 'the end of the previous chapter' of the work beginning on lv; it reproduces the text found on fol. 17r, beginning at exactly the same point. The only explanation is that the copyist was working with unbound 16-page gatherings before him: leaving 1r blank, he filled his first gathering (1v-8v), and then his second (9r-16v); but then, instead of taking up an entirely blank gathering, he picked up the first in error and continued copying onto fol. 1r, not noticing his mistake until he had filled the page, whereupon he re-copied the continuation from 16v onto the present 17r.

⁶ *fī karyat 'U'sbk*, with an incomprehensible vocalization; possibly (al-)Esbek or (mis-spelt) İlyās-beg. A copyist of this name (which is, however, of course common) completed a MS of Aḥmedī's *Tarwīḥ al-arwāḥ* ('harekeli nesih') in 932/1526 'at Bozdağ' (F. E. Karatay, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi kütüphanesi: Türkçe yazmalar kataloğu*, I, Istanbul, 1961, no. 1768).

⁷ Chardin's?

⁸ Fully described by P. Wittek, in *MOG*, II, 1-2, 1925, 151-64, and evaluated by F. Giese, *Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Āşıkpaşazāde*, Leipzig, 1929, Einleitung, pp. 8-12.

⁹ One probative passage is 'Āpz., § 67, the first section of which (ed. Giese, 66.22-67.7) is a patent—and clumsy—interpolation into the text of the Anon. (ed. Giese, 34.23). The Digby MS (fol. 50v) has the same presentation.

¹⁰ The following (fol. 13r = 'Āpz., § 17) is typical: *bir cenk-i 'aẓīm ētdiler ki kāfirlere dünyāyı tenk ētdiler, şöyle kim küşetlerden püşteler oldı, adam kanı seyl oluban yürüdi, hūn biḥārı havā yüzün bürüdi; boz at, kara at yek-renk oldı; ak sakal, kara sakal hem-renk oldı; şirāne ve delirāne bir cenk ētdiler kim feleklerde melekler taḥşin ētdiler. Āḫir . . .*

¹¹ fol. 57r. Cf. Oruç (ed. Babinger, 37.8-10, 105.12-14) and MS A of Neğri (ed. Unat-Köymen, I, p. 362).

¹² fol. 69v: *Rāvi eydür: bu cānibde meger Sultān Murāduñ bir oğlu var-idi, adına Sultān 'Alā-dīn dērlerdi, Amāsiyye taḥīnında otururdu; ol Sultān 'Alā-dīne ağu vērüb helāk ētdiler.* Cf. H. İnalçık, *Fatih devri üzerinde tetkikler ve vesikalar*, I, Ankara, 1954, 60.

the short but more interesting work (fols. 121v-125v) which the same copyist has transcribed.

This second text begins with a series of sentences giving the dates of birth, the lengths of reign, and the ages at death of the Ottoman rulers from 'Osmān to Mehemmed II inclusive, and the next three lines present, in schematic form, the dates for the fall of six cities. Then, after the heading *Tārīḥ* in red ink, follows a continuous text listing the events of the reign of Murād II, from his accession to the marriage of Prince Mehemmed to the Zū'l-ḳadr princess. This continuous text was, however, evidently intended by its compiler to be read as a series of 29 independent paragraphs, all but the first introduced by the word (written in red in the Digby MS) *Def'a* 'And again: ', 'Item: '. Each of these paragraphs should have ended with a (Hijri) date; but only occasionally has the copyist written in, either before or over the *def'a*, the word *sene*, and still more rarely has he written in, over or under the *sene*, in red or in black, the date—and all but one (829) of these dates are patently wrong. However, with the help of the closely related chronicle texts it is a simple matter to supply the dates which are lacking, and so to arrive at a consistent and consecutive series of 'annals'.

In editing the text I have divided it into paragraphs, heading each annal with the date (in square brackets) which the Annalist may be presumed to have intended but leaving uncorrected the few dates in his text. I have indicated in angle brackets the points where a few letters or words have demonstrably been lost in transmission (but have refrained from speculating whether, and if so where, a whole 'item' may have been jumped). Obvious errors of spelling and vocalization, however startling, have been tacitly corrected.¹³ Page and line references to the parallel passages in the chronicle-texts are given in the concordance at the foot of this page.¹⁴ Details not found

Year	Giese	E	O	C	M	P
826	59.17-18, 60.18-19, 64.15-18	32v.4-9	47.17-23	113.16-23	42v.13-43r.7	38r.7-18
827-9	64.18-22	32v.9-33r.2	47.23-48.21	113.23-114.6	43r.7-43v.1	38r.18-39r.14
830	65.16-17	33r.2-3	48.21-24	114.6-8	43v.1-5	39r.14-17
831-5	65.17-25	33r.3-13	48.24-49.23	114.8-25	43v.5-lacuna	39r.17-40r.9
836-40	65.25-66.10	33r.13-34r.1	49.23-51.4	114.25-115.24	lacuna-44v.4	40r.9-41r.14
841-5	66.10-23	34r.1-13	51.4-52.24	115.24-117.5	44v.4-lacuna- 45r.5	41r.15-42v.15
846	66.23-27	34v.1-6	52.25-53.14	117.5-10	45r.5-45v.2	42v.15-43r.14
847	66.27-67.3	34v.6-11	53.14-24	117.11-18	45v.3-15	43r.15-43v.8
(to)						
849-51	70.8-22	37v.3-38r.12	58.21-59.21	120.25-121.17	50v.4-lacuna	47v.17-48v.16
852	70.23-26	38r.12-38v.4	59.21-24	121.17-20	lacuna	48v.16-49r.3
(to)						
final	73.7-18	40v.8-41r.5	64.4-12	123.1-7	lacuna	52r.5-13
items						

¹³ e.g. *cenk* for *Canik*, *argur* for *Uzğur*.

¹⁴ I use the following abbreviations: Giese = F. Giese, *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken: Teil 1*, Breslau, 1922; (using Giese's sigla) W₁, W₂, M₂ = (respectively) the expanded

in the chronicles or recorded elsewhere in the chronicles are romanized, but I have commented only occasionally on divergences among the chronicles. The text being so corrupt, the annotation does not pretend to be thorough. A full analysis of the data would open the way to a discussion of much of the chronology of Murād II's reign; but it would be rash to set out far upon that road from so unreliable a starting-point.

Āl-i 'Osmān. <'Osmān> *ibn-ü Ertoñrul vüçüda geldi, hicretüñ sene 6<??> tārīh; 'Osmān Ġāzī ħurūc etti, adına ħuṭbe okundu, hicretüñ sene 687; 'Osmān beglik etti sene 26, ve 'ömri sene 69. Oğlı Orḥān Ġāzī vüçüda geldi, sene 687; Orḥān beglik etti sene 40, ve 'ömri sene 82. Murād Ġāzī ibn-ü Orḥān vüçüda geldi, <sene . . .; beglik etti> sene 31, 'ömri sene 68. Oğlı Yıldırım Bāyezīd vüçüda geldi, sene 744; beglik etti sene 16, ve 'ömri sene 60. Oğlı Sultān Muḥammed vüçüda geldi, hicretüñ <sene . . .; beglik etti> sene 8, ve 'ömri sene 65. Sultān Murād ibn-ü Sultān Muḥammed Hān vüçüda geldi, sene 807; beglik etti sene 31 mäh 3, ve 'ömri sene 48. Oğlı Sultān Muḥammed Dimetokada vüçüda geldi, sene 834; beglik etti sene 33 mäh 2, ve 'ömri sene 52. Oğlı Sultān Bāyezīd Amāsiyyede vüçüda geldi, sene 851.¹⁵*

<i>feth-i</i>	<i>feth-i</i>	<i>feth-i</i>	<i>feth-i</i>	<i>feth-i</i>	<i>feth-i</i>
<i>Brusa</i>	<i>Gelibolu</i>	<i>Edrene</i>	<i>Dimetoka</i>	<i>İbşala</i>	<i>Qosantın</i>
<i>Orḥān</i>	<i>Süleymān Paşa</i>	<i>Murād Ġāzī</i>			<i>Sultān Muḥammed</i>
<i>sene</i>	<i>sene</i>	<i>sene</i>	<i>sene</i>	<i>sene</i>	<i>sene</i>
726	788 ¹⁶	761	765 ¹⁷	763	857

Tārīh:

[824/6.1.1421–25.12.1421]

Sultān Murād ibn-ü Sultān Muḥammed Hān tahta cülüs kıldı, hicretüñ sene 824. Kardaşları ile cenk etti.¹⁸ Vezīrleri 'İvāz Paşa, İbrāhīm Paşa.

[825/26.12.1421–14.12.1422]

Def'a: Sultān Murād kardaşları ile girü bu yıl cenk etti. Karındaş Düźme Muştafā dërler anı katl etti, geldi, Edrenede karar etti.

version of the 'anonymous chronicle'; the unexpanded but extended version; the Munich MS frequently cited in the apparatus, which is in fact, up to Giese 66.11, a *W*₃ text and thereafter an 'Oruç'. E = the Edirne MS of the 'anonymous', substantially a *W*₃ text but with some distinctive (and apparently archaic) features. O, C, M, P = the Oruç texts, (respectively) the MSS of Oxford and Cambridge, published by Babinger, the Manisa MS, and Paris, MS supp. ture 1047. My conclusions concerning the interrelation of these texts are set out in *BSOAS*, xxx, 2, 1967, 314–22.

¹⁵ The text being unreliable, it is profitless to scrutinize these figures. It is perhaps worth noting that they correspond broadly with those given by 'Aşıkpaşazāde (§ 170; Atsız, p. 248), who calls his source for them *aşıl tevārīḥ* (or *aşl-i tevārīḥ*?)—possibly a list similar to this. Similar figures appear dispersed through the text of Oruç, and not only in the late recension which avowedly contains interpolations from 'Āpz.: see S. Buluç, *Untersuchungen*, Breslau, 1938, esp. p. 49.

¹⁶ Read, with Giese, 17.5, 758.

¹⁷ Read, with Oruç (O 20.20), 760.

¹⁸ MS: *kardaşları ile girü bu yıl cenk etti karındaş*, with *girü bu yıl* and *karındaş* deleted (the copyist having slipped into transcribing the next year's entry).

[826/15.12.1422–4.12.1423]

*Def'a: Sultân Murâd bir karındaşı dañı çıkdı Muştafâ dërler; varub, Anañoluda İznikte*¹⁹ *cenk êdiüb, soñra katl êdiüb, andan geliüb, İflāk-êline geçüb, İflāk begi Durkulaıyla cenk êdiüb, soñra barışub, geliüb gitdi. Vezîri 'İvâz Paşadan bir hîle duyub, gözlerin çıkarub, yerine Saruca Paşa vezîr oldi.*²⁰

[827/5.12.1423–22.11.1424]

*Def'a: Sultân Murâd giriü Anañoluya geçdi. İzmür-oğlı Cüneyd Beg-ile cenk êdiüb, soñra dutub, kaydın görüb,*²¹ *andan varub Menteşe-êlini ve Aydın ve Saruhan-êlin ve Hamîd-êlin feth êtdi. İbrâhim Paşa veled-i Hayreddin Paşa, Saruca Paşa.*

[828/23.11.1424–12.11.1425]

*Def'a: Sultân Murâd sefer êtmeyüb, Edrenede düğün eyleyüb İsfendiyâr kızını aldı.*²² *Vezîrleri giriü İbrâhim Paşa, Saruca Paşaydı.*

[829/13.11.1425–1.11.1426]

Def'a: Sultân Murâd Laz-êline vardı. Lâz-oğlı Koca Desbut(ı) êlinden çıkarub vilâyetini feth êtdi. Vezîrleri mezkûr. Sene 829.

[830/2.11.1426–21.10.1427]

*Def'a: Sultân Murâd sefer êtmeyüb Sakar*²³ *yaylaya çıkdı. İshāk Bege, <Tur>hân Bege çevre êllere*²⁴ *akın vërdi, her tarafa yürüdiler. Vezîrleri mezkûr. Sene —.*

[831/22.10.1427–10.10.1428]

*Def'a: Sultân giriü Lâz-êline vardı, Gügercinliği*²⁵ *feth êtdi. Ve giriü bu tarafdan*

¹⁹ MS: 'rñkmwdn, vocalized ?Erenkmüdün, presumably to be emended to *Iznikte* (as EOCM), but cf. P: *Er.nkümür yöresinde buluşub uğraşdılar*.

²⁰ The blinding of 'İvâz Paşa is mentioned in OP, *sub anno* 828, in what appears to be an interpolation (see below). That Saruca became vizier as early as 826/1423 is a new detail, certainly textually (if not historically) correct, cf. next annal: hitherto the earliest reference to Saruca as 'vizier' has been for 1428 (Ducas, 205; cf. P. Wittek, *Byzantion*, xxi, 1951, 328).

²¹ For 'seized and attended to [i.e. killed]' Cüneyd, the chronicles have 'expelled', recording his death and the taking of Ayasoluk (O, but MP: İpsala) *sub anno* 829.

²² ECM have substantially the same text (CM adding *çevre êllere akın vërdi*); OP, however, have a long entry recording the campaign against İsfendiyâr (spring 1423 = 826) followed by the marriage (different wording), the siege of Constantinople (summer 1422 = 825!), the Küçük Muştafâ affair (repetition!) and the blinding of 'İvâz Paşa (P: *Izniki feth êdiüb ol seferden geliüb vezîri Hâcî 'İvâz Paşadan bir hîle duyub* Gelibolıda *dutub gözlerini çıkardı*), the death (P: *vefât êdiüb*, O is corrupt) of 'Laz-oğlı' (Stephen Lazarević, d. 19.7.1427 = 830), and the Hungarian attack on Gügercinlik/Golubac (spring 1428 = 831). It seems that items from another (undated?) *takvim* have been interpolated here (cf. O 48.5 and P 38v.9: *ba'zılar eydürler/dërler*). To make the textual problem still more complex, the W₁ texts lack the 'marriage' item altogether.

²³ MS: *Sefer* (as CP), but to be corrected to *Sakar* (with EOM): the Sakar hills lie some 50 km. north-west of Edirne.

²⁴ The chronicles have *Laz-êline* and do not name the leaders. The item presumably refers to the operations led from Üsküb (İshāk Beg's base) against Novobrdó (which was besieged) and Kruševac/Alacaahışar (which was taken), see Jorga, *GOR*, I, 395; Jireček, *Geschichte der Serben*, II, 164.

²⁵ EMP and W₁ (but not OC) name also *Cân Adası* (W₃: *Sıçan Adası*), presumably the

Anadoluda Amâsiyyede Yörgüç-oğlu Hızır Beg varub Canık vilâyetini feth êdî. Sultân 'Alâ'eddîn ibn-ü Sultân Murâd vücûda geldi. Vezîrleri İbrâhîm Paşa, Saruca Paşa, Muhammed Ajaydı. Sene —.

[832/11.10.1428–29.9.1429]

Def'a: Sultân Murâd Edrenede karar êdüb, vezîri İbrâhîm Paşa vefât êdüb, oğlu Halîl Paşa yerine vezîr oldı. Mevlânâ Velîyeddîn kâdî²⁶ oldı. Sene —.

[833/30.9.1429–18.9.1430]

Def'a: Sultân Murâd vilâyetlere nâmeler gönderüb, gazâ-yı ekberdür dëyüb, varub, Evrenos-oğlu 'Alî Beg, Turhân Beg varub, Seleniki feth êdîler. Ve bu yıl Sultân Şeyh Hâcî Bayram vefât êdî.²⁷ Sene —.

[834/19.9.1430–8.9.1431]

Def'a: Sultân Murâd sefer êtmeyüb, girü²⁸ yaylaya çıkdı. İri²⁹ akça kestürdi. Sene —.

[835/9.9.1431–27.8.1432]

Def'a: Sultân Murâd sefer êtmeyüb, Çökeye³⁰ yaylaya çıkdı. Dimetokada Sultân Muhammed vücûda geldi. Vezîrleri mezkûr.

'ungarische Insel' of Jireček, II, 160. Incidentally, Jireček's suggestion that this was Neu-Orsova = Adakale receives support from the fact that when the Ottomans re-took Adakale (not yet so named) in 1691 'it was given the name Şâns Adası' (Silihdâr, II, 542); no doubt this name refers (as A. Decei points out, in *EI*, second ed., s.v. Ada Kâl'e) to the 'entrenchments' (German 'Schanz', cf. Redhouse, s.v. şânş), but the resemblance between Cân and Şâns suggests that Şâns is also a re-casting, as Turkish army slang, of an older Cân; and this in turn appears to reflect the medieval name 'Saân' (see A. Z. Hertz, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, III, 1971, p. 171, n. 4).

²⁶ i.e. kâdî'asker (as P, which alone of the chronicles mentions this item), in succession to Halîl Paşa, who was promoted to the vizierate from that office (OP).

²⁷ Only in P, which also appends the viziers: Halîl, Mehemmed, Saruca.

²⁸ EOP read Çökeye (C lacks the 'yayla' item), presumably correctly: cf. the letter of Murâd II, of 9 June [1431], written *na Çöku na planını* (Truhelka, no. 3, cf. *Ist. Enst. Dergisi*, I, 1955, 43), cited by Babinger, *Aufsätze*, I (*Geburtstag*), 169. Babinger could not then (1949) identify the locality; but in his history of Mehemmed II (*Eroberer*, 7 = *Conquérant*, 21 = *Conquistatore*, 33), without giving a reference, describes it as lying north-west of Edirne.

Administratively, Çöke was a *nâhiye* of the *każâ* of Edirne, embracing (with other localities which I cannot trace on the map) the villages of Demirhanlı and Ömerobası (Ö. L. Barkan, in *Belgeler*, III, 5–6, 1966, 320, 329, 363), the first of which is shown on modern maps some 15 km. east-north-east and the second 40 km. north-east of Edirne. Other villages of the *nâhiye* were Karayusuflu and Faki-deresi (M. T. Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı*, İstanbul, 1952, 326, 497), the residents of the last being *derbendcis*, guarding the road 'from Bogdan and Dobruca'. 'Karajusuf' is marked 18 km. north-east of Edirne on the Austrian General Staff map of 1829. This map also records as 'Faki-dere' the river (now Fakiiska, in Bulgaria) on which is situated 'Umurfakih (Faki)' (now Fakiya), 70 km. north-east of Edirne on the road to Aitos. The *yayla* of Çöke is therefore to be located north-east of Edirne, somewhere to the west of the *yayla* of Keşirlik.

²⁹ MS (clearly): *îdî*; EOC (*sub anno* 835): *yeñi*; but P: *iri*. The issue of 834 represented a temporary return to the heavier *akça* of 5½ and even 6½ *kîrât* (M. Akdağ, *Türkiye'nin iktisadî ve içtimaiî tarihi*, I, Ankara, 1959, 394, 422–5; cf. OCP, with the note that 260 *akças* were struck from one *lîdre* of silver), so that *iri* is a tenable reading.

³⁰ E: no name; OCP: *Sakar*.

[836/28.8.1432–17.8.1433]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karar edüb, ikindüyile aḥşam arasında gün dutuldu, 'ālem karañılık olub, yıldız göründi; girü iki kuyruklu yıldız doğdı, korkuluk; ve Evrenos-oğlu 'Alı Beg Arnavud < >³¹ vilāyetinde Buzurşek³² üzerinde leşkerümüze şikest vāḳı' oldı, gāzilere bu gāzā rāst gelmedi.

[837/18.8.1433–6.8.1434]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karar edüb, beglerbegisi Sinān Beg, Evrenos-oğlu 'Alı Beg, İshāk Beg, Turhān Beg varub < >³³ eddiler. Ve bu yıl Ungurus kiralı Koca Kiral gelüb, Gügercinlige düşüb, almayub, şikest olub gitdi.³⁴ Sene 838.

[838/7.8.1434–26.7.1435]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Keşürlük³⁵ yaylasına çıkub, Lāz-eline akın vērdi.³⁶ Ve hem bu yıl vebā-ı ekber oldı her vilāyetde. Vezirleri mezkurdur.

[839/27.7.1435–15.7.1436]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karar edüb, Vulk-oğlıyla barışub, veziri Saruca Paşayı gönderüb, Vulk kızını nikāh edüb aldı. Vulk-oğlu Semendreyi binā <edüb> tamām etti.³⁷ Vezirleri mezkür.

[840/16.7.1436–4.7.1437]

Def'a: Sultān Murād vilāyet-i Karamāna sefer etti. Karamān-oğlu İbrāhīm Begle cenk edüb, soñra baruşub, andan gelüb, bu tarafda Boraç³⁸ hisārını feth etti. Vezirleri mezkür.

[841/5.7.1437–23.6.1438]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede Yeñi Cāmi' binā edüb, kendü eliyle Cum'a gün bināsım urub, Ungurus vilāyetine kaşd edüb, veziri Muḥammed Ağayı çıkarub, yerine Hekim Fazlullāh vezir olub, Ungurusa geçdi. Altı pāre ḳal'alarını feth edüb, vilāyet-i Ungurusda kırk beş gün yüriyüb, soñra gelüb, İflāk-élinden çıkub,

³¹ Some words lost by haplography, cf. E: *Arnavud vilāyetine akın eyleyüb rāst gelmeyüb Arnavud vilāyetinde . . .*

³² MS: *b'rdşky*, corrected after E (OP: *B.r.zş.k*), and cf. Giese, 113.8. For this name see F. Babinger, *Aufsätze*, I (*Elbasan*), 202.

³³ The missing words refer to the suppression of the Albanian rebellion (discussed by H. İnalcık, in *Fâtih ve İstanbul*, I, 2, 1953, 164–6).

³⁴ This entry presumably refers to Sigismund's attack in spring 1428 (Jireček, II, 164), i.e. 831 (recorded in OP in an interpolation *sub anno* 828, see above, p. 574, n. 22). 'Aşıkpaşazāde, it is true, describes (§ 106) an attack in 837 (and is followed by İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı tarihi*, I, second ed., Ankara, 1961, 414), but his chronology (even his sequence of events) is much distorted for these years; he may well be describing the events of 1428.

³⁵ MS: *k.stürl.k*, corrected after EOMP. The locality Keşirlik is marked on modern maps 55 km. north-east of Edirne.

³⁶ There is no record of this raid in the chronicles, under this or another year.

³⁷ This item is not in E or Giese; the Oruç texts give extra detail.

³⁸ MS: *bür'c*, apparently understood as Burc in the chronicles. I take the reference to be to Boraç (on the Gruža, south-west of Kragujevac), which was taken, however, according to Jireček (II, 174–5) in 1438 (= 842–3).

*gelüb Edrenede karar etti. Ve hem bu yıl Ergene köprüsi binası dağı vuruldu.*³⁹
Sene 181.

Beyt: Yeñi Cāmi'-ile Ergene köprüsini Hayr edüben yaptı ol ikisini
*Ungurusa geçdi Sultān-i Murād Kodılar tārīh aña 'hummar' ad.*⁴⁰

[842/24.6.1438–13.6.1439]

*Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karar edüb, Sultān 'Alā'eddīni Sultān Muḥammedi 'ālī düğün eyleyüb sünnet eyledi. Düğünden soñra varub, Semendreyi feth etti. Girü bu yıl Evrenos-Beg-oğlu 'Alī Beg vilāyet-i Ungurusa geçüb, Ungurus tahtı Mehdiye dərler ol şehri vurdu. Ve girü Ungurus leşkerine duş gelüb, gāyet cenk edüb, soñra Hāk ta'ālā fırsat vērüb, Ungurus leşkeri<ni> sıyub, kırub, baş baş on beş sancak-beglerini dutub, bile sancağ-ıla getürdi.*⁴¹
Vezirleri ol yıl Hālil Paşa, Saruca Paşa, Hekīm Fażlullāh idi. Sene 844.

[843/14.6.1439–1.6.1440]

*Def'a: Sultān Murād Belğırāda varub, feth olunmayub, andan gelüb Nevābiri kal'asını feth etti. Hādım Şehābeddīn Paşa hem vezir hem beglerbegiyidi, Belğırād öninde havāleyi yaptı.*⁴² *Vezirleri Hālil Paşa, Saruca Paşaydı. Sene 845.*

[844/2.6.1440–21.5.1441]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karar edüb, düğün edüb, kızını sultān-zāde<yı> İsfendiyār-oğlu Kaya Bege vərđi. Üskübde İshāk bu yıl Hicāza gitdi. Sene 849.

[845/22.5.1441–11.5.1442]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karar edüb, Mezīd Bege <akın vērüb> Ungurusa gāzāya gönderdi. Ol gāzā rāst gelmeyüb, Mezīd şehīd olub, leşkere şikest vākī' oldı. Sene 846.

[846/12.5.1442–30.4.1443]

*Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karar edüb, beglerbegi Şehābeddīn Paşayı Ungurus vilāyetine gönderüb üç biñ Yeñi-çeriyile, sancak-beglerinden Fırüz Beg, Ya'küb Beg, Veled-i Fenārī Umur Beg,*⁴³ *bunuñ biği nice sancak-begleri, tamām on altı sancak-begleriyle. Girü leşkerümüze şikest vākī' olub, sancak-begleri cümle şehīd oldılar. Ol gāzā girü rāst gelmeyüb, bākī kalan leşkerler gelüb gütdiler. Sene 847.*

³⁹ Not recorded in E, Giese, or P. OCM (and M₂) mention it earlier in the annal, together with the 'New' (i.e. Üç Şerefeli) Mosque.

⁴⁰ MS: *todılar tārīh anlara hummar ad.* P has only the second couplet: *Ungurusa geçdügi Sultān Murād / komışlar tārīhin anuñ hummar ad.* M margin has simply: *tārīh hummar 841.*

⁴¹ All texts have the Semendre item, and under 842: the campaign, beginning in March 1439 with Semendre falling in August, covered the two years 842–3. OCP record 'Alī Beg's expedition (not mentioned in E or Giese), but in different words, *sub anno* 843, immediately after the Belgrade item—and perhaps correctly, if it was intended as a diversion during the siege of Belgrade (cf. Jireček, II, 176), i.e. in summer 1440.

⁴² The 'havāle' point appears in OP (only) after the mention of Şehābeddīn Paşa *sub anno* 846.

⁴³ ECM give no names, O has two, and P (adding Hızır Balı) has four.

[847/1.5.1443–19.4.1444]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Hān Karamāna sefer  tdi, oğlu Sultān 'Al edd n Am siyye le keri bile. So ra İbr h m Begle ger  sulh olunub, gel b gid b Edrenede q r r  tm   iken, ol h nde Sult n 'Al edd n n vef t  haberi gel b, Sult n Mur d bu m tem i indeyiken || Dest-pot Ungurusdan Yanko mel' n< > get r b  zladi derbendinde cenk  d b, b k  k   a ma'l mdur. Sene 848.

[848/20.4.1444–8.4.1445]

Def'a: Sult n Mur d H n begliğini terk  d b, oğlu Sult n Mu ammede  s marlayub Anadoluda q r r  tm   iken, Unguruz k ral< > ve beglerbegisi Yanko mel' n Varnaya gel b, Sult n Mur d Saru an Anadoludan gel b, le kerler cem'  d b, — bu yıl   sk b Begi     k Beg vef t  d b — oğlu ' s  Beg ve ' mer Beg veled<-i> Tur  n Beg — ol va t Tur  n Beg Tokatda  abs idi — H z r Beg veled<-i> Mi  l Beg, bu begler cem' olub, Varnada 'az m cenk olub, so ra f rs t g z ler n olub, k fire  ikest v k ' olub, k ralu n ba ı kesildi.

Varna g z s n d r-ise n   h-i m  D d ler t r   a a ' zev k-i m  '.⁴⁴

[849/9.4.1445–28.3.1446]

Def'a: Sult n Mur d H n begliğini terk  d b, oğlu Sult n Meh mede  s marlayub, varub Anadoluda y rde⁴⁵ q r r  d b,   hr-i Edrene tam m yanub  ar k olub, ol va t vez rleri H l l Pa a, K sim Pa a, R m- li beglerbegisi T ay  Karaca, Anadolu beg<lerbegisi> Uz ur-o lu ' s  Beg. Sene 855.

[850/29.3.1446–18.3.1447]

Def'a: Sult n Mur d H n Anadoluda Ma'nisada q r r  d b, bunda Edrenede Ye n  eri ba  kaldurub, Bucuk Depeye  ıkub, ' lem kar   mur   olub, ' k bet begler itt f k-ıla Sult n Mur d H n< > Anadoludan get r b, gir  ta ta ge  b, Sult n Meh med  Anadoluya g nder b, ol k   Moraya sefer  d b, varub Germey  feth  d b, bu yıl 'Acem p di   h    h-i Ru  vef t  d b,⁴⁶ vez rleri H l l Pa a, Saruca Pa a, K sim Pa a,   h bed n Pa ay d . Sene 851.

[851/19.3.1447–6.3.1448]

Def'a: Sult n Mur d Edrenede q r r  d b, Sult n B yez d ibn-  Sult n <Meh med> do d .

[852/7.3.1448–23.2.1449]

Kos-ovanu  t r  n b lemek d lerse  sen hem n

Bu g z nu  t r   '  all k-i sub  n '.⁴⁷

Def'a: Sult n Mur d Arnavuda sefer  tdi, Kocac k  i  r n  feth  tdi. || Gir  ol h nde gir  Yanko mel' n Ungurus vil yetine k ral olub, le kerler cem'  d b,

⁴⁴ MS: *d mi  ler anu  t r  n zev k-i m *, emended after P (47v.16), which alone of the chronicles gives this couplet.

⁴⁵ *Sic*; chronicles: *Ma n s ya*. A few words have perhaps been lost.

⁴⁶ This obit appears only in P.

⁴⁷ P gives (52r.4), with no couplet, the chronogram *  l k-i sub  n* (either phrase gives the correct total, 852).

<Kos>ovaya geldi. Sultān Murād dañı Kos-ovaya çıkdı. Cenk olınub, soñra kâfirler'e şikest vâkı' oldı. Kos-ova cengi Şa'bān ayınuñ 24 Cum'a gün.⁴⁸

Sultān Murād Edrenede qarār edüb, beglerbegisi Karaca Beg Rüm-eli leşkeri ile varub, Yérgök hisārını yapub meremmet étdiler.

Ve hem düğün edüb, Dū 'l-Kādir-oğlı kızını Sultān Mehemmede alıverdi. Begler, vezirler yêrlü yerinde. Tamām.

A close general resemblance to the Anonymous Chronicles in the recension of MS W₃ and MS E and a still closer resemblance to the Oruç texts is apparent from the beginning of the annal which I have dated 826 up to the word *içindeyiken* in the annal for 847. But whereas before this block of common text these Annals have merely two laconic entries for 824 and 825, the chronicles here share a detailed account of the operations against Murād II's uncle 'Düzme' Muştafā; and after the *içindeyiken* they have a much fuller text describing the two great campaigns of the İzladi Pass (1443) and Varna (1444). The Annals and the chronicles then run parallel for the years 849, 850, and 851, to diverge again after the first sentence of the entry for 852, where the chronicles present a long account of the battle of Kosova (1448). They come together again for the final items, with indisputable verbal correspondences, but also with patent discrepancies, to whose possible significance we shall return.

First we consider the fundamental question: have these Annals been excerpted by a copyist from one of the chronicles, or do they represent—admittedly in a debased form—the source adopted by an early compiler of the chronicles to serve as the framework for his account of these years?

Recent 'form-criticism' of the chronicles has indicated (1) that the common matter shared by about the first half of 'Aşıkpaşazāde's history with the Anonymous-Oruç group derives principally from an anonymous⁴⁹ chronicle-text, not extant in its original form, which apparently ended with the account of Düzme Muştafā's capture and execution (in 825/1422, something over a year after Murād's accession in June 1421);⁵⁰ (2) that the succeeding matter in the chronicles represents one or more chronological lists (*takvīm*); (3) that the chronicles are, here and there, filled out by interpolated *ğazānāmes*—discursive popular accounts of the most noteworthy campaigns.⁵¹

The 'Annals' in the Digby MS present, I contend, a text of almost exactly the character⁵² and of broadly the content which these assumptions lead us to predicate for the first chronological list to be appended to the basic chronicle text. My hypothesis is that an early compiler, having recorded from the basic

⁴⁸ At this point the chronicles give the date 852 and begin a new annal; see below, p. 580.

⁴⁹ Not 'the *menāķib* of Yağsı Fakih', see *BSOAS*, xxvi, 1, 1963, 52.

⁵⁰ When I give no specific reference for a date I am following the chronology in Halil İnalcık's invaluable critical collation of the Ottoman and the Western sources in his article 'Murad II' in *İslām ansiklopedisi*.

⁵¹ H. İnalcık, in Lewis and Holt (ed.), *Historians of the Middle East*, 159.

⁵² The exception is the system of dating, for the discussion of which see below, p. 583.

text the death of Düzme Muştafâ, reproduced the Annals for 826–46 in full, and then, towards the end of the Annal for 847, interpolated a *ğazânâme* for the İzladi campaign (the precise point of interpolation may now be identified in the chronicles by the characteristic phrase of transition . . . *içindeyiken / Gerü bu taraftan* . . .);⁵³ he continued to use the same, or another, *ğazânâme* for Varna (848), and then returned to the Annals for 849–51, when there were no major campaigns. Having (probably) adopted the Annals' first item for 852, he switched, with a similar phrase of transition,⁵⁴ to a *ğazânâme* for Kosova.

The converse interpretation, that the Annals are merely passages excerpted from a chronicle-text, is hardly tenable: it implies that the excerpter had available a chronicle containing various details not found in any known manuscript⁵⁵ and also that he dropped not only the '*ğazânâme*' matter (which admittedly he might have found too discursive for his purpose) but also the long passage on Düzme Muştafâ which figures in all the chronicle-texts⁵⁶—and which, reproduced as it is by 'Âşıkpaşazâde,⁵⁷ must be presumed to have stood not in an appended *taķvīm* or *ğazânâme* but in the early redaction of the chronicle which 'Âpz. used. The bare entries for 824 and 825 in the Digby MS represent, I suggest, the original text of the *taķvīm*, which the compiler left aside, preferring the longer account offered by his chronicle-source.⁵⁸

Still granting only the presumption that the Annals represent the original text, we turn to the final entries to see whether, as the hypothesis requires, the chronicles show at this point any signs of editing by a compiler. Digby's Annalist runs together in his final, undated, paragraph the capture of Kocacık/Svetigrad, the battle of Kosova, Murâd's residing at Edirne, the re-fortifying of Giurgiu, and the marriage of Prince Mehemmed. The dates of the first two events are clearly established—July and October 1448, both falling in A.H. 852, and this is evidently the year to which this first part of the paragraph relates. The marriage, however, certainly took place later. The late Professor Babinger argued for spring 853/1449, being strongly influenced by the sequence presented in Oruç,⁵⁹ namely:

⁵³ E 34v.11 = Giese 67.3; O 53.24 = C 117.18 = M 45v.15 = P 43v.8.

⁵⁴ *-iken / bu egnâda*: E 38v.4 = Giese 70.26; O 59.24 = C 121.20 = P 49r.3.

⁵⁵ Some of these items are considered below, p. 582.

⁵⁶ E 31v.3–32v.3 = Giese 56.2–59.16; O 46.6–47.15 = C 112.11–113.15 = M 41v.4–42v.12 = P 37r.4–38r.6.

⁵⁷ §§ 83–7.

⁵⁸ It is interesting that the Annalist regards Muştafâ as Murâd's 'brother' (in fact he was his uncle) and yet calls him 'Düzme', 'Impostor'. The 'brothers' of the annal for 824 must be the two Muştafâs, for the haggling with the Byzantine Emperor over the two younger brothers, Yūsuf and Maḥmūd, hardly ranks as 'warfare' (*cenk*). This tradition of the 'two brothers' seems to have figured also in the chronicle-source: see 'Âpz., heading to § 82 (*ve karındaşları daḥr ne oldu*), Yūsuf and Maḥmūd not being mentioned until § 94), and cf. Giese 55.29: *Sultân Meḥmeddün oğlanları her taraftan baş kaldurdılar* (so too E, whereas the phrase is lacking—edited out?—in Oruç). 'Rūḥī', incidentally, also refers to Murâd as Düzme Muştafâ's 'brother' (MS Marsh 313, fol. 106v, but omitted in the Algiers and Berlin MSS).

⁵⁹ O 64.4–16 (and now P 52r.5–19). C does not mention the marriage.

853: Murād at Edirne; Giurgiu; the marriage; Murād went to a *yayla*;

854: unsuccessful siege of Akçeḥişār;

855: death of Murād, Wednesday 1 Muḥarrem.

Babinger contended, in effect, that Western sources, dating the long siege of Akçeḥişār (Kruja) to April-(?)September 1450, confirm Oruç's date of 854; that Oruç explicitly places the marriage in the preceding year; and that if Murād went after the marriage to a *yayla*, a *summer*-residence, the marriage must have taken place in spring 853/1449.⁶⁰ İnalcık, however, has convincingly rejected this dating⁶¹ in favour of late 854 (beg. 14.2.1450), on the ground of the almost exact agreement of two completely independent sources: Ducas's dating to the September–December before Murād's death (i.e. 1450) and Enveri's to Şevvāl-Zu 'l-Ḳa'de 854 (November–December 1450). Murād died in the first days of February 1451, a matter of weeks afterwards, so that for an 'annalist' the marriage must have been the last 'event' of his reign.⁶² The Digby Annalist, it seems clear, having preserved his dated series of entries up to the Kosova item (852), simply tacked on, without a '*def'a*', the undated items 'Giurgiu' (probably 853)⁶³ and 'marriage' (certainly 854).

But what has happened in the chronicles? Oruç's sequence is patently wrong, and this is rather surprising, since Oruç seems, by and large, to be more reliable than the other chronicle-texts. A plausible explanation for the confusion is that we are here indeed at a point in the chronicles where two sources have been inexpertly stitched together: if a compiler, having before him the Digby text with its items 'Murād at Edirne'—'Giurgiu'—'marriage', and finding in his next source the items '*yayla*'—'Akçeḥişār'—'death', failed to notice that they needed to be interwoven (to give the closing sequence 'Akçeḥişār'—'marriage'—'death') and simply appended them in a block, the result would be the (demonstrably incorrect) sequence of Oruç.⁶⁴

So far the case still, perhaps, falls short of proof, but an argument or two can be added. If these Annals represent the source, we should expect them to present here and there details which can be proved from external evidence to be closer to historical reality than the presumably worked-over (and hence presumably deteriorated) chronicles. This indeed seems to be the fact: the Annals record a new issue of coinage in 834, a date confirmed by the coin-

⁶⁰ *Aufsätze*, I (*Heirat*), 229–32.

⁶¹ *Fatih devri üzerinde tetkikler ve vesikalar*, I, Ankara, 1954, 108–9.

⁶² cf. also 'Äpz.'s moralizing comments in § 121, that with his son married Murād had achieved all his earthly goals.

⁶³ For the historical context (the installation of a pro-Ottoman voyvode in Wallachia) see H. İnalcık, *Fatih devri*, p. 98, n. 130.

⁶⁴ The redactor of W₁ (who revised and expanded the text, not always successfully) gives the apparently impeccable sequence:

853: Giurgiu; raid into Wallachia and appointment of new voyvode;

854: siege of Akçeḥişār; marriage 'that winter';

855: death of Murād, Wednesday 1 Muḥarrem.

It seems that he had access to a good source (Enveri?), which gave him the 'Wallachia' item and the correct sequence.

catalogues, whereas the chronicles put this item in 835; they record the birth of Mehemmed II in 835, against the chronicles' 834;⁶⁵ and they record Murād II's first abdication (in August 1444) as the first 'event' of 848 (beg. 20.4.1444), whereas the chronicles, appending it to the events of 847, put it too early.

Again, if the Digby Annals represent the source, we may expect them to preserve two or three details which the compiler of the chronicle-text dropped, either by accident or because they seemed to him no longer of importance. Such might be: (1) the names of the begs leading the operations of 830; (2) the birth of Prince 'Alā'eddīn (ascribed to 831);⁶⁶ (3) the attribution of the capture of Salonica (833) to the *uc-begis* rather than to the sultan himself;⁶⁷ (4) the Hungarian attack on Golubac;⁶⁸ (5) the pilgrimage made by İshāk Beg of Üsküb (ascribed to 844)⁶⁹ and his death (apparently in 848).⁷⁰

Conversely, it is true, the chronicles record various items which this text of the Annals seems to have dropped: the final campaign against Cüneyd in 829,⁷¹ the Ottoman occupation of 'Cân Adası' in 831, the names of the towns in Karaman taken in 840, etc. The Annals have therefore survived in this manuscript only in a truncated and corrupt version; and even where the text appears to be beyond suspicion its data can occasionally be proved to be inaccurate: thus the fall of Borač (1438) occurred in A.H. 841 or 842, not in 840; the fall of Semendre (August 1439) occurred in 843, not in 842; the fall of Novobrdó (June 1441)⁷² occurred in 845, not in 843.⁷³

The principal point of general interest is that the Annals so frequently mention the names of the viziers. This characteristic has hitherto been regarded as peculiar to the Oruç texts; but it now seems clear that it was the original *takvīm*-source that not only recorded the names when there was a change in the membership of the Divān but also, for the other years, either repeated the names (as in the Annals for 827, 828) or noted, in the words *vezīrleri mezkūr*

⁶⁵ The strong evidence in favour of 835 is summed up by İnalçık in *Fatih devri*, p. 55, n. 2.

⁶⁶ Enverī, the only other Ottoman source to give a date, has 830; cf. *Fatih devri*, p. 55 and n. 4.

⁶⁷ cf. also the tone of 'Āpž.'s § 105.

⁶⁸ See above, p. 576, n. 34.

⁶⁹ 'Āpž. accompanied İshāk Beg on this pilgrimage (§ 113), but his chronology is in confusion. However, since he states that they returned 'before Semendre fell' (August 1439), the pilgrimage they made was presumably that of 841 (Dhū 'l-Ĥijja 841 = June 1438).

⁷⁰ He is called 'merhūm' in a *vakfiyye* of 848 (İnalçık, *Fatih devri*, p. 83, n. 67).

⁷¹ See above, p. 574, n. 21.

⁷² So Jireček, II, 178. İnalçık ('Murad II', col. 607a), following the chronicles, prefers 1440.

⁷³ A discrepancy of one year in the middle years of Murād's reign is not surprising, for the 31 Ĥijrī years cover only 30 solar—and thus 'campaigning'—years and in the decade 835–45 Muḥarrem moved back from September to May; hence even a careful annalist could easily misdate by one a summer's event falling this side or the other of the Muslim new year. A clear example is the eclipse and the comet both recorded *sub anno* 836: the eclipse occurred on 17.6.1433 (Oppolzer, no. 6284, see Babinger, in *MOG*, II, 3–4, 1926, 313), which indeed falls in 836, but the comet (September 1433, see V. Grumel, *Traité d'études byzantines. 1. La chronologie*, Paris, 1958, 475), though it appeared at the end of the same summer, in fact belongs to 837.

or the like, 'no change' (as in the Annals for 829, 830, 835, 838, 839, 840). Such a phrase has survived only twice in the Oruç texts: ⁷⁴ evidently Oruç or his copyists dropped nearly all the 'no change' notes, whilst the compiler(s) of the 'Anonymous Chronicles', both in the Giese redactions and in the redaction of MS E, omitted all references to the viziers.⁷⁵

The arrangement in these Annals suggests further that the 'viziers' note came consistently at the end of the year's entry but before the date. In Oruç, however, a viziers-entry sometimes appears after the date (but before the *Girü* ... introducing the next annal); and comparison with this text suggests that such an entry may not (as it appears to) belong to the immediately preceding date but to the following annal. Under 841, for example, this text records (and, exceptionally, in the middle of the annal) the replacement of Mehemmed Ağa by Faẓlullāh; yet in OCM this note appears immediately after the date 840 ⁷⁶ and in P it is dislodged onto the margin against the 840 entry.

Given that the Digby text is patently poor, and given also that some of the discrepancies between it and the Oruç texts may arise not from corruption but from conscious revision by Oruç, it is profitless at this stage to analyse the entries too closely, but this much may be said: that in exploiting the valuable data in Oruç one should bear in mind the possibility that an item has 'drifted' from the correct to an adjacent year; and that Oruç's vizier-entries are now seen to be not his personal contribution to the textual tradition of the 'Anonymous Chronicles' but a feature which he preserved from the *taḳvīm*-source, just as his ostensibly characteristic *dībāce* was preserved (as MS E demonstrates) from the original chronicle-source.⁷⁷

There remains one objection to our accepting the Digby text as reproducing the *taḳvīm*-source of the chronicles: its method of dating. Each annal in the 'royal' *taḳvīm*-lists is dated not by Hijrī years but by the number of years elapsed since the compilation of the Palace almanac in which the list appears; and although the chronicles nowhere have a 'years elapsed' numeral, Giese (but not Oruç) occasionally presents instead of the expected finite verb the grammatical construction—*-eldenberü*, 'since [the event] occurred'—which the 'years elapsed' dating system demands. In the early redaction E, these constructions are numerous, appearing first in the annals for 791 and 800; ⁷⁸

⁷⁴ M 44r.1 (*vezirler mezkûrlar*, apparently referring to 837); O 51.19 (*vezirleri kemā-kān*, immediately after the date 841).

⁷⁵ The naming of the three viziers at Giese 55.24–5 (*sub anno* 824) is part of the 'narrative' and stood in the chronicle-source (cf. 'Äpz., § 81). (The Annals text, naming only two for 824, is not necessarily defective, since Bāyezid Paşa had probably been killed by the end of the year.)

⁷⁶ Hence İnalçık, following O, has dated Faẓlullāh's appointment to 840 ('Murad II', 605b); but the Annals' date and wording (*kaşd edub*) fortify his point (*Fatih devri*, 1) of the connexion between Faẓlullāh's entry into the Divān and the adoption of an aggressive policy in Europe.

⁷⁷ See *BSOAS*, xxx, 2, 1967, 321–2.

⁷⁸ These, and some other early items, are evidently interpolations in the basic chronicle-source.

then in a cluster for 829–31, 833–47, 849–50 (reign of Murād II); and sporadically for 11 years between 866 and 893. The chronicles' *taḳvīm*-source(s), it would appear, were constructed, like the 'royal' lists, on a years-elapsed system of dating, which the compiler(s) of the chronicles re-computed—and remarkably successfully—into Hijrī years, only Oruç making a clean sweep by eliminating every redundant *-eldenberii*.

That the Digby text bears no such trace of a 'years elapsed' dating is at first sight an argument against its priority to the chronicle-texts. But the argument weakens when the apparent confusion in its Hijrī dates is analysed. After the correct date within the annal for 824, there is no *sene* entry at all for the presumptive years 825–8, 835–6, 838–40, 848, 851–3, and only *sene* with a blank for 830–4. '829' is correct; '181' (in spite of the chronogram) for 841 is an index of the copyist's stupidity; and '849' for 844 and '855' for 849 are little better. But two entries show a two-year and five a one-year discrepancy;⁷⁹ and these errors, not to be explained by a copyist's confusion of figures or of words, are precisely those which would probably, indeed inevitably, arise from a 'years elapsed' system of computation. Thus the Digby text's inaccurate presentation of Hijrī dates is an argument not against but for its priority: we are confronted by the efforts of a not over-intelligent copyist who was attempting to re-compute the dating from a years-elapsed system into Hijrī years—and who was, for the most part, giving up the struggle.

As to the Annalist himself, although at first sight the words *bunda Edrenede* in his entry for 850 suggest that he was resident in Adrianople, the *bunda* read in the context may mean only 'in Rūmēli' (as opposed to the immediately preceding 'in Anadolu'); to judge from his interest in the *uc-begis*, and more particularly İshāk Beg, and from his recording the capture of the little fortress of Borač, his interests appear to have lain more specifically in Macedonia. His text seems to be a crucial piece to be fitted into the jigsaw puzzle of the Anonymous Chronicles; it is a pity that the copyist did not transmit it with its edges more clear-cut.

⁷⁹ Respectively '844–5' for 842–3; '838', '846–8', '851' for 837, 845–7, 850.